

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patont and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box MSO Alexandrid, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/477,099	01/04/2000	FREDERICK S. DUNLAP	P04056 8711		
34456 7	7590 08/31/2005		EXAMINER		
	ARSON & ABEL L.I				
5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746		33	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
71001111, 171	707.10				

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/477,099	DUNLAP ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

Advicery Action	09/4/1/033	DONEAL ELAE.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jacob F. Betit	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the following the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C	ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
	a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the is after the mailing date of the final rejection	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) by reduce any				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 May 2005. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any replacements.	any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	37(e)), to avoid dismis	ssal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	· ——						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ient canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wovided below or appended.	rill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		•					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar							
and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		1					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			•				
11.  The request for reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration.	dered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition fo	r allowance				
See Continuation Sheet.	(DTO/0D/00 DTO 4440) D	No(a)					
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li></ul>	. (P+O/SB/08 or P+O-1449) Paper	1VO(S)	V				
		SAM RII PRIMARY E					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: By combining claim 1 with claim 10 and combining claim 11 with claim 20, the claims which depend from claims 1 and 11 require new consideration because during examination the examiner did not consider the case where these dependent claims are dependent from claims 10 and 20 instead of claims 1 and 10. Further by adding new claims 23-26 the applicant is making new limitations that require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: All of the arguments made in the remarks made after the final office action were addressed in the final office action (as indicated below).

The applicant's arguments that "Shimazu fails to disclose or suggest that the transistor ... is selectively connected to one of the outputs of the inverters", the arguments were addressed on page 8, lines 5-12 of the final office action.

The applicant's arguments that "Shimazu provides no disclosure or suggestion that the transistor ... is connected to the output of the inverter by a programmable connect", the arguments were addressed on page 8, lines 14-21 of the final office action.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Matsumura and Shimazu as proposed", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 3 provides this motivation.

Continuation of 13. Other: This is a supplemental advisory action being mailed in response to the applicant's petition to the director and is deemed to further clarify why the amendment after the final office action was not entered by the examiner.